

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

Voting

UNITED STATES v. DALLAS COUNTY

Correspondence

United States Court of Appeals

FIFTH CIRCUIT

EDWARD W. WADSWORTH  
CLERK

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 20120  
NEW ORLEANS 20, LA.

July 2, 1963

DOCKETED

JUL 9 1963

#13728

Mr. William J. O'Connor  
Clerk  
U. S. District Court  
Mobile, Alabama

Re: No. 20665 - United States of America  
-vs- Dallas County, Alabama,  
et al

Dear Mr. O'Connor:

Find enclosed certified copy of Petition for an Injunction and Order denying same in the referenced cause, together with a certified copy of the Order dismissing the appeal on motion of appellant, which order takes the place of a mandate.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. WADSWORTH, CLERK

By

*57 Gannick*  
Deputy Clerk

encls. ✓

cc and encls.:  
Mr. John Doar ✓  
Hon. Richmond Flowers

7-3-63  
10 JUL 5

R. S. M.

CIV. DIV.  
JUL 10 1963

Correspondence - U.S. v. Dallas County,  
Ala - 1971 B-2

(Dallas County, Ala )

72-3-45

13, 726

**PITTS & PITTS**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
SELMA, ALABAMA

ARTHUR E. PITTS 1928-1968  
W. CHARLES PITTS  
—  
CHILD, S. J. JAMES, JR.

October 19, 1963

*Send to Third  
Judge copy for  
Case*

Honorable Daniel M. Thomas  
United States District Judge  
Mobile, Alabama

In re: United States v. Dallas County, Alabama, et al  
Civil Action No. 2246-63

Dear Judge Thomas:

I received a copy of Mr. John Dear's letter to you under date of October 16, 1963, and I want to take this opportunity in behalf of the defendant, Jim Clark, and as attorney for the Board of Registrars of Dallas County, to object to the procedure that is outlined in his letter.

First, this is a case against Jim Clark wherein it is alleged that he intimidated certain persons to prevent them from registering to vote because of their race. The production of the records from the Dallas County Board of Registrars would not prove or disprove this fact. It will only serve the purpose of glossing up the record and giving the Government the opportunity of checking the Board of Registrars.

The Government has rested its case, and we object to reopening the case for the purpose of offering into evidence any records from the office of the Probate Judge of Dallas County, Alabama.

It is not John Dear's real purpose to offer the records of the Board of Registrars in evidence, but he is attempting to gain access to the records of the Board of Registrars and in support of this, we cite

-2-

Honorable Daniel H. Thomas  
October 19, 1963

that he wants the information from the date of the registration case to the date the case at bar is tried. John Doar and his many Government assistants have harassed this Board of Registrars for over two years and we feel it is time for the Court to prevent him and his many assistants from continuously harassing three gentlemen who constitute the Board of Registrars of Dallas County, Alabama.

For the above reasons, we vigorouslly object to the procedure that is outlined in John Doar's letter of October 16, 1963, and as stated above, this objection is not only for the defendant, Jim Clark, but it is also in behalf of the Board of Registrars of Dallas County, Alabama.

Yours very truly,

  
McLean Pitts

McLP/cap

cc: Hon. Blanchard McLeod  
Circuit Solicitor  
Camden, Alabama

Honorable Gordon Madison  
Assistant Attorney General  
Montgomery, Alabama

Honorable T. G. Gayle  
Attorney at Law  
Selma, Alabama

Honorable John Doar  
U. S. Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Victor B. Atkins  
Dallas County Board of Registrars  
Dallas County Court House  
Selma, Alabama

-3-

Honorable Daniel H. Thomas  
October 19, 1963

Mr. James G. Clark  
Sheriff of Dallas County  
Dallas County Court House  
Selma, Alabama

COPY

1 that it would have to go in that motion.

2 MR. DOAR: That's right.

3 JUDGE LUTCHERSON: And of course you don't  
4 need that. You asked for relief and he didn't give it  
5 to you, so he refused to grant your motion.

6 MR. DOAR: That's right. That's right.

7 Now, finally, with respect to whether or  
8 not you should consider this to be a denial, is that  
9 if you don't consider it, and you take this thing up  
10 on a final action or a final judgment, it will be too  
11 late to effectively grant us the relief that we are  
12 supposed and directed to seek, that is, preventive  
13 relief.

14 Now, if you get by that question, then  
15 there is the question of whether or not there is ir-  
16 reparable injury, and whether the plaintiff is likely  
17 to prevail, whether the issuance will substantially  
18 harm the defendant.

19 I think the public interests involved  
20 in this type of thing are relatively simple. All we  
21 are asking by this injunction is that the defendant  
22 obey the law. All we are asking is that he apply the  
23 registration procedures with an even hand from this  
24 day forth.

25 Now, the Sixth Circuit, in a case under

GRANT PERRY  
HOUSTON

1 JUDGE HUTCHESON: I have a case in mind  
2 that you don't need-- that says in a proposition like  
3 this that a District Judge who is asked for a prelimin-  
4 ary injunction on account of an emergency, who just,  
5 by one way or another, refuses to act on the request,  
6 has denied the injunction.

7 MR. DOAR: I think that's got to be the  
8 rule.

9 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Because the nature of  
10 an application for a temporary injunction is that time  
11 is of the essence.

12 MR. DOAR: That's correct.

13 JUDGE HUTCHESON: And when the Judge's  
14 action puts it off deliberately, or however, he has  
15 denied the temporary injunction.

16 MR. DOAR: I believe that's true, Your  
17 Honor. Particularly, and the record reflects here--

18 JUDGE HUTCHESON: It isn't because of  
19 saying that he had indicated that he didn't want to  
20 grant it. The point is that he refused to grant it.

21 MR. DOAR: That's right.

22 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Of course, there are  
23 two remedies. You could probably do it by mandamus.

24 MR. DOAR: That's right.

25 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Well, mandamus means



1 any process at all, Judge, even on the preliminary  
2 injunction?

3 JUDGE TUTTLE: I would anticipate--

4 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Did you ask for any  
5 process? Did you ask for any process, and it was  
6 denied you?

7 MR. SMITH: No, sir. No, none at all.  
8 But I say, if we went to the extreme that you say,  
9 once we started putting witnesses on the stand, then  
10 we would be denied due process of law under the  
11 fourteenth amendment and under the constitution, yes,  
12 sir.

13 JUDGE TUTTLE: I would say that I think  
14 you have a complete misconception of the duty of a  
15 trial court to pass on a motion when it is made in  
16 the trial.

17 When any lawyer makes a motion to a  
18 trial court, he is entitled to have the motion passed  
19 upon.

20 Now, if the plaintiff in a temporary  
21 injunction proceeding is foolish enough to move for a  
22 temporary injunction after his first witness is heard,  
23 and after he has barely made out a prima facie case,  
24 if he is foolish enough to do that, the Judge would  
25 probably say, "I will deny your motion." Thereupon,

GRANT PERRY  
HOUSTON

1 he undertakes to put on more proof, and when he gets  
2 all through with this, he could then say, he has a  
3 perfect right to say, if he thinks he has made out a  
4 sufficiently strong case, "Your Honor, I now move that  
5 you grant a temporary injunction." He is entitled to  
6 have that motion passed upon. The Judge will grant  
7 it or deny it. He would probably deny it, if the  
8 defendant were present and offering counter-evidence.

9 But you were present, the state was  
10 present, the people were present, and they elected not  
11 to go forward with their evidence at that time. That  
12 didn't deprive the plaintiff of his right to move again,  
13 when and there, on the showing that he had made, for a  
14 temporary injunction. He was entitled to have that  
15 passed upon. The Judge could either grant it or deny  
16 it.

17 Now, he could deny it on the ground that  
18 he wanted to hear further a month later from the other  
19 people; but he is entitled to have it passed upon.

20 Now, I don't believe you conceive of  
21 that as being the normal procedure in the trial of a  
22 case.

23 ~~MR. CHASE:~~ Well, sir, let me-- I'm  
24 glad you brought that point out, the normal case.

25 JUDGE TUTTLE: That's right.

1 reason why the thirty days to answer, because they  
2 were going to reduce the thing to writing and make it  
3 possible for us to get an answer on it.

4 JUDGE WISDOM: It was not the custom,  
5 when I practiced law, necessarily to file an answer.

6 MR. ROBERTS: That's right, but when you  
7 have--

8 JUDGE WISDOM: On a temporary injunction.

9 MR. ROBERTS: That's right. But then,  
10 when you practiced law, if the Court please, Your  
11 Honor, when you practiced law and you started into an  
12 injunction hearing, and the plaintiff's side put on  
13 two and three-fourths days testimony, and the other  
14 side didn't put on any testimony, and didn't have a  
15 chance to put on any testimony, your Judge didn't grant  
16 an injunction when he was doing it in that manner,  
17 trying to get the facts down before him to make a  
18 decision; you just didn't do it that way, and you wouldn't  
19 n't take two and three-fourths days of testimony and  
20 then say, "Well, I have heard that side, and I don't  
21 know a thing about the other side, and I don't care  
22 anything about the other side, I don't care whether  
23 that's the truth or isn't the truth, or whether it can  
24 be denied or briefed; I am going to rule this way or  
25 that way." What would you do, on the bench? What

1 would either one of you do on the bench? I say,  
2 please, what would you do?

3 JUDGE TUTTLE: I would grant it or deny  
4 it.

5 MR. ROBERTS: Would you grant it or  
6 deny it before you, as the Judge sitting up there,  
7 had given them the time, and you had said, "I am going  
8 to give both sides the time to hear it," and you hadn't  
9 heard but one side; would you go ahead and grant it  
10 anyhow?

11 JUDGE TUTTLE: I would deny it, I said,  
12 or I would grant it if he made out a case.

13 After all, the plaintiff's rights are  
14 the thing the plaintiff is seeking to have vindicated,  
15 and the plaintiff might show such rights even before  
16 the defendant ever has an opportunity to show anything.  
17 If it would cause me to believe that the plaintiff  
18 is entitled to relief, I might grant it. But if I  
19 didn't grant it, I would certainly deny it.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Would you in any event,  
21 Judge, when you hadn't heard the other side?

22 JUDGE TUTTLE: Why wouldn't I?

23 MR. ROBERTS: Because they might not  
24 want to do it.

25 JUDGE TUTTLE: You don't get the point,

1 Mr. Roberts. My denying of it at that moment would  
2 not stand in the way of the defendant coming on in  
3 later on and proving all they wanted to prove. And  
4 after they did it, then I might grant it. To deny  
5 the temporary injunction today, that doesn't say you  
6 can't grant it a month later. You know that.

7 MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate that thorough-  
8 ly. I have been in it just last week, for three days,  
9 before the same judge, and we had an application for  
10 temporary injunction in a civil suit, not like this  
11 one, though, and we had the same thing, and this morn-  
12 ing's mail in Hattiesburg brought me his decision,  
13 that he denied the injunction. But--

14 JUDGE TUTTLE: You can move for it  
15 thirty days later if the facts change, or if you have  
16 additional evidence.

17 MR. ROBERTS: But that was a case where  
18 we put on everything we wanted to, and we put on our  
19 testimony, three days, and we did not do it by the  
20 affidavit rule. We didn't do it that way, we did it  
21 the other way, and he took it under advisement, and  
22 in a week's time, he decided it. And when he got his  
23 testimony on here, he intended to take that thing and  
24 decide what he wanted to do.

25 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Will you let me state

1 the thing that I. on my mind?

2 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, sir.

3 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Not as to what I would  
4 do with this, but just what are you arguing we should  
5 do?

6 In the first place, in an application  
7 for injunction, time is of the essence, for a tempor-  
8 ary injunction, and the practice has always been to  
9 grant the temporary injunction. Of course, this  
10 wasn't to the extent of a peremptory or mandatory  
11 injunction; but if the Court has spent three days in  
12 hearing the evidence, and then the defendant refuses  
13 to go on, but wants to wait thirty more days, the plain-  
14 tiff has a right to say, "Judge, I am dying in the  
15 meantime, grant me a temporary injunction and then do  
16 what you want to later on."

17 MR. ROBERTS: Judge, I have great respect  
18 for your thinking on that, but you weren't there; and  
19 if you were there and saw it, at the end of the day,  
20 and this dictation had been put into the record, with  
21 all this new stuff, and no chance to show anything  
22 about it, you wouldn't have done it, Judge, if you had  
23 been in his place.

24 JUDGE HUTCHESON: I wouldn't say I would-  
25 n't necessarily give the defendant thirty days more to

1 get some more evidence; but in the meantime, I would  
2 act on the temporary injunction. That is the purpose  
3 of it.

4 MR. ROBERTS: But it isn't mandatory,  
5 and he didn't do it. It isn't mandatory. And he said  
6 himself that whenever-- and this thing hasn't been  
7 heard-- did you know that our Court, the District  
8 Court convenes in Hattiesburg this coming Monday, and  
9 that is when the case convenes, the Court convenes?

10 JUDGE TUTTLE: Well, it has been pending  
11 nine months now.

12 MR. ROBERTS: That wasn't brought up,  
13 though, Judge. This testimony was just recently had.

14 JUDGE TUTTLE: We get a motion for tem-  
15 porary injunction, a suit for temporary injunction,  
16 and you say it hasn't been passed on after it has been  
17 pending in Court for nine months; now, do we have to  
18 wait for the term in Hattiesburg?

19 MR. ROBERTS: No, sir, and we didn't.  
20 We went to Jackson and put on testimony for three days,  
21 the Government put it on, without having affidavits.  
22 If they had put on affidavits, we would have had  
23 counter affidavits. We didn't know what they were  
24 going to say. We had no chance to know. And the  
25 Judge, looking at it-- doesn't a District Judge, doesn't

1 a Court, a trial Court, have any rights at all? Can't  
2 he look at it? He--

3 JUDGE HUTCHESON: He has no right except  
4 to do right.

5 MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

6 JUDGE HUTCHESON: He has no right except  
7 to do right.

8 MR. ROBERTS: Except to do right; and  
9 whenever he looks at it, and decides that is what's  
10 right, is that he hear the other side before he makes  
11 a decision, is that right or wrong?

12 JUDGE HUTCHESON: That's wrong. If he  
13 had--

14 MR. ROBERTS: Well, Judge, you oughtn't  
15 to decide against us today, if he had to decide that  
16 way.

17 JUDGE HUTCHESON: I practiced law in the  
18 state courts, and we had lots of case law on that  
19 subject, but a temporary injunction is something, in  
20 this state, if I remember right it is a chancellor's  
21 writ by which they prevent time from ravaging a man  
22 to pieces while he has to wait.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, when it is that kind  
24 of thing, that's correct; at times that happens. But  
25 that wasn't the situation that was here. And after



1 all, the trial judge had some opportunity to see the  
2 situation and know what it is, and know whether there  
3 is going to be any irreparable injury.

4 JUDGE HUTCHESON: But that motion demanded  
5 immediate action, and he ought to grant it or deny it,  
6 either way.

7 Mr. ROBERTS: But does this Appellate  
8 Court look down on that without knowing the facts,  
9 without having a chance to know the facts?

10 JUDGE HUTCHESON: We know the facts.

11 MR. ROBERTS: No, sir, I'm sorry--

12 JUDGE HUTCHESON: That's what we have  
13 our quarrel with, what went on down there. A Kilkenny  
14 Fair.

15 MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon?

16 JUDGE HUTCHESON: It was kind of a Kil-  
17 kenny Fair they were trying to put on down there.

18 MR. ROBERTS: No, sir, I want to beg to  
19 differ with the Court.

20 JUDGE HUTCHESON: Ask these two young  
21 men that have been talking. They think it was a Kil-  
22 kenny Fair.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Well, I think-- they are  
24 younger than you and I are, Judge. But I want to appeal  
25 to you, that-- I really, as I rode over on the plane

1 this morning from New Orleans, I read the record of  
2 the Government, and I thought that Judge Cox was put  
3 on trial. But I want to tell you that in my opinion,  
4 that no Judge has ever been on anybody's bench that will  
5 come nearer wanting to do right than will Harold Cox,  
6 if he is given a chance; and I think that is what he  
7 tried to do here. I think he did it with the finest  
8 kind of consciousness, and with a great desire to do  
9 right, and to be sure he was right; and he now wants  
10 to be sure that he is right. If he thought that that  
11 day, he would have been dishonest with himself; he  
12 wouldn't have been a court of conscience like he ought  
13 to have been. He would not have been a court of law  
14 like he ought to have been. He wouldn't have been  
15 what he ought to have been, had he decided it that day,  
16 when he only heard one side of it; and he didn't de-  
17 cide it, and since he didn't decide it, we say that  
18 this Court does not have any jurisdiction, because  
19 there is no order and there is no chance for an order  
20 to have been had in this Court, we humbly submit.

21 JUDGE HUTCHESON: He either had a lack  
22 of experience for an injunction, and didn't understand  
23 what it was, or he just was trying to prevent an appeal.  
24 Nobody ever tried a temporary injunction like that in  
25 the history of the world, at least in my world. I don't

1 know what you all have down there. He can go out and  
2 sit in back of the woodshed, but he can't find any  
3 facts; that is not any part of a temporary injunction,  
4 pleadings and things.

5 MR. ROBERTS: But who put it down? The  
6 Government put it down.

7 JUDGE TUTTLE: Who required it? Who  
8 made the motion--

9 MR. ROBERTS: Nobody.

10 JUDGE TUTTLE: Wait a minute, Mr. Roberts.  
11 The defendants filed the motion to make more definite  
12 and certain.

13 MR. ROBERTS: That's right.

14 JUDGE TUTTLE: And the defendants objected  
15 to granting the motion under Rule 34, to get the evi-  
16 dence, to get the facts on which to make response to  
17 your motion to make more definite and certain. Is that  
18 not true?

19 MR. ROBERTS: That may have been my  
20 approach, yes, sir.

21 JUDGE TUTTLE: All right. Now, this has  
22 no part with a hearing on a temporary injunction, you  
23 know that.

24 MR. ROBERTS: I am not arguing that. But  
25 I am arguing, Judge, if we got down to a hearing, and

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

# Memorandum

TO : John Doar  
First Assistant  
Civil Rights Division

DATE: July 11, 1963

DHM:eks  
72-3-45  
13,728

FROM : David H. Marlin  
Attorney

DHM  
Hewitt

SUBJECT: Trial Preparation for 42 U.S.C. 1971(b) case in  
Dallas County, Alabama

The following are the persons who should be subpoenaed as witnesses for the injunction hearing in this case. Not all of the information, such as addresses, is available at this moment but I will obtain that information and forward it to Washington.

✓ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED], Selma, Alabama
✓ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Selma, Alabama
✓ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Selma, Alabama
✓ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Birmingham, Alabama
✓ [REDACTED]	address unknown Selma, Alabama
✓ Victor B. Atkins (Chairman of Board of Registrars)	address unknown Selma, Alabama
✓ Sheriff James G. Clarke, Jr.	address unknown Selma, Alabama
✓ Deputy Sheriff Charles H. Weber	address unknown Selma, Alabama
FBI Agents: ✓ [REDACTED]	both of whom are stationed at the resident office in Selma, Alabama

7/15 There are some additional witnesses to the  
[REDACTED] arrest which I did not know about at the  
beginning of the preliminary investigation. Jd

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Marion Junction, Alabama

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Selma, Alabama

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Selma, Alabama.

In addition to the people listed above, there are other persons who were in the courthouse at the time of [REDACTED] arrest who observed the conditions in the courthouse at the time of arrest. The names of these persons are contained in an FBI report which is unavailable at this time. This report has been received by the Department, however, and when it becomes available the names of those persons should be taken off and listed as potential witnesses.

Testimony

The persons listed above as potential witnesses can testify to the following:

1. Bernard La Fayette - he can testify that he was asked by the Dallas County Voters League in February, 1963 to come to Dallas County to assist the Voters League in voting registration drive. He can testify that he is a paid field secretary of the SNCC. He can testify that he did come to Dallas County on February 10, 1963 and can describe in detail the activities that he has carried on while in Dallas County; namely, recruitment of young persons to assist in voting registration, the organization of mass meetings whose purpose is to encourage Negroes to attempt to register to vote, organization of clinics or classes to teach Negroes wishing to become registered about the Alabama application form, and other things they may need to know in order to become registered. He can testify about the publicity that was given him and these activities by the newspapers in Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham. He can also testify to the success of his activities as he has attended practically

every clinic that has been held in Dallas County since February, 1963. They are held twice a week on Tuesday and Thursday nights. He can also testify as to the mass meetings, what transpired at the mass meetings that he spoke at. He can testify that he was beaten up following his speaking at the mass meeting of May 14th at the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Selma. We have photographs showing his injuries which required six stitches in his scalp. He can testify as to the discussions and instructions he gave [redacted] and [redacted] about observing registration in the Dallas County courthouse and finally he can testify about his arrest for vagrancy and the circumstances thereof. In short, he can testify to all the information contained in his affidavit that has been submitted to the Court.

2. [redacted] - can testify to his arrest on June 17, in the Dallas County courthouse and the circumstances thereof. He can also testify as to the incident on June 1, 1963 with respect to his passing out leaflets. Both of these incidents are detailed in the affidavit submitted to the Court.
3. [redacted] - can testify as to his knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the arrest of [redacted]. This information is also detailed in his affidavit which has been submitted to the Court.
4. [redacted] - [redacted] can testify as to the history of the league prior to its invitation to Bernard Lafayette to come to Dallas County to assist the league. He can also testify to the success of Bernard LaFayette's activities and to the increased interest and participation on the part of Dallas County Negroes in the registration campaign. [redacted] and can testify as to the number of persons that

he knows of who have attended the clinics.

I do not recommend [redacted] as a witness, however, as he tends to be garrulous and abstract. I believe that we can obtain a better witness to testify to the background of the events in Dallas County prior to Bernard La Fayette's arrival and to the success of Bernard La Fayette's activities after February, 1963. In this connection, I believe that the following lady will be more than satisfactory.

5. [redacted] - She is an [redacted] of the Voters Clinics and has been entrusted with the job of keeping the records of the number of persons who have attended these clinics. She can bring her records and testify as to the number of persons (I believe 90 since February, 1963) who have attended the voters clinics. She is a very personable lady and I think will be an excellent witness.

When I am in Selma, I will be seeking other witnesses to the background of the Dallas County activities.

6. Victor B. Atkins - is the Chairman of the Board of Registrars in Dallas County. I believe he should be subpoenaed and the records of the Board should be subpoenaed with him, i.e., the records pertaining to the number of persons of both races who have applied for registration to the Board for the last 18 months, approximately. The purpose of this testimony would be to show that prior to the arrival of Bernard La Fayette in Dallas County very few, if any, Negroes were applying to register and that since Bernard La Fayette's arrival a considerable number of Negroes have attempted to register to vote.
7. Deputy Sheriff Clark - this is, of course, a key witness as to the events in Dallas County. Clark

is, of course, a defendant in this suit. I believe that the questioning of Clark must be extremely limited. I don't believe we should ask him any questions - the answers of which we do not know but he can be questioned as to his stationing officers inside the church and his handling in general of the mass rallies of Negroes. He also can be questioned concerning the arrest of Bernard La Fayette for vagrancy and the transcript we possess of the trial will make it possible to impeach him as a witness. In this connection we, of course, may decide not to ask him questions about this on direct examination and we may decide that it is better to get into the matters of the arrest of La Fayette and of [redacted] on cross-examination. He certainly would be a key witness for the State and on second thought, I believe that he would be better on cross-examination all the way. The same would be true of Deputy Sheriff Charles Weber who actually made the arrest of La Fayette and who also testified at the trial of La Fayette in the Dallas County Court. The cross-examination of both Weber and Clark needs a great deal of work and I will work on this on my trip.

I believe that we should write down the questions that we want to ask and have a sound conference on this so that whoever is going to do the cross-examination has a very good conception of what to expect from Sheriff Clark and what the Government should ask him.

8. Special Agents [redacted] and [redacted] of the FBI should be on the scene and subpoenaed to testify if needed as to their observations of the Negro mass rallies.

I believe one of the defenses the State will make relating the activities of Sheriff Clark and his men and the Sheriff's posse is that there was great danger in Dallas County of violence; therefore, Sheriff Clark properly acting under his police function, stationed men at the rallies, not with



the motive of intimidating Negroes desiring to vote but in order to preserve the public peace. This is on the Sheriff's part ~~partially~~ a spurious claim as the rallies were conducted in Negro neighborhoods, at Negro churches, and attended solely by Negroes. There was no indication from anything that there would be violence although apparently some white men did show up at the church. I think the significance of the Sheriff's activities is not so much stationing people outside but what is significant is copying down the license plate number of all Negroes who attended or who arrived by car at the respective churches where the mass meetings were held and of stationing men inside the church. Lt. Suther was stationed inside the church for the first two mass meetings with a walkie-talkie and he relayed what happened inside the church to those on the outside. Although the walkie-talkie did not apparently create a nuisance because of its noise it undoubtedly can well be argued that it has an intimidating effect on Negroes to have all their activities spied upon so openly by Dallas County officials.

I know that [redacted] and [redacted] did make some observations at the mass meetings but I don't know what detail as yet but when I am in Selma on this trip I will speak to both [redacted] and [redacted] and determine whether or not their testimony in this respect will be helpful. I think it could be necessary for the Government to show that there was a preponderance of force, and to establish that license plate numbers were being copied down and that there was no need to station officers inside the church taking notes and speaking over a walkie-talkie. Both agents, of course, have participated to some extent in all of the 1971(b) investigations we have conducted in this case and may be able to supply other testimony of value to the Government although I have not analyzed that at this time.

9. [redacted] - is a lady who was waiting in the Dallas County courthouse to register to vote at the time of [redacted] arrest. She

apparently arrived at the courthouse between 2:30 and 3:00 p.m. and left at approximately 3:30 p.m. In her statement to the Bureau, although she does not say so specifically as she was not so asked by the interviewer, she can testify that there was no disturbance in the hallway. She is a white lady.

10. [REDACTED] - this is a Negro lady who was waiting in the courthouse in line with [REDACTED] to register to vote and who saw both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the courthouse. She also can testify that there was no disturbance in the courthouse or threat of any breach of the peace.
11. [REDACTED] - he is a Negro man who was waiting in line to register to vote along with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. He also saw both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the courthouse and can testify that there was no disturbance or threat of one in the courthouse. The purpose of having [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as witnesses is to dispute the State's charge of the present that [REDACTED] was engaged in "Conduct calculated to provoke a breach of the peace". The persons I referred to earlier in the FBI report, which I do not have before me now, who also were in line will add corroboration to that of these three people that there was no disturbance and that the charge is unsupportable. Also one white man whose name is in the report (unavailable at this time) stated to the FBI that he saw Sheriff Clark grab [REDACTED] by the back of the neck and propel him into the Sheriff's office and I believe his testimony will be valuable with respect not only to the breach of the peace charge but conceivably to the charge of resisting arrest.

I have not had time to give complete attention to all the details in the preparation of this case but as I see it now these are the witnesses that the Government would require to prove its claim. Additional investigation is needed in this case and I will get started in that at Selma.

Typed: 7/17/63

JUL 17 1963

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

SM:DLN:cks  
72-3-45  
13,728

Re: N. S. v. Dallas County, Alabama

One of the defendants in this case is Sheriff (last) of Dallas County. Previous information supplied by you indicates that the Sheriff of Dallas County has organized a posse presumably in preparation to suppress racial disturbances. Since this and similar information has often, and properly come to us under such captions as "Racial Situation", "State of Alabama", we have not classified or organized as such the details of the activities of the office of the Sheriff of Dallas County.

The hearing on the Government's motion for a preliminary injunction is scheduled for July 23, 1963, at 9:30 a.m. at the Federal Court in Mobile, Alabama. In preparation for that hearing please provide us with the following information to be obtained from your files and from what ever investigation may be needed. Since Dallas County, itself, is a defendant this investigation necessarily goes beyond the activities of the Sheriff's office.

1. Who are the members and employees of the Sheriff's office and of Sheriff's posse? What connection, if any, do any of these persons have with the Ku Klux Klan or the Citizens Council or other such organizations? What activities have any of these persons been involved in connection with these organizations? What business interests, if any, do these persons have beyond their official positions in the Sheriff's office? Are the members of any of their immediate relatives involved in or connected with any such organizations? If so, in what capacities and what have been their activities?

cc: USA (Mobile, Ala.)  
Records  
Chrono  
Mr. Doar  
Mr. Putzel  
Trial File (Rm. 1140)

2. Please furnish an alphabetical list of any members of the Influx Klan or the Citizens Council or other such organizations who either reside or have business interest or employment in Dallas County. Indicate the connection each has or has had in any such organization and his activities connected with any such organization.

3. Sheriff Clark, being a defendant in this case, will probably be a witness at the hearing. Please make available all information you have regarding his activities in racial matters whether or not connected with any organization. The same information should be provided regarding his deputies and members of the Sheriff's posse acting in their official or private capacities. If some or all of this information has already been supplied to us please give us appropriate references to the reports. The information which we receive from you is ordinary classified by us according to subject matter and not according to individuals.

4. How long has the posse been organized and what is its purpose, what has been its function and activities Dallas County and elsewhere, where there have been recent racial disturbances, such as Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, Oxford, and Jackson. Have any members of the posse been active in connection with the Negro Voter Registration mass meetings held in the past several months in Selma, Alabama.

Please make one copy of this report available to Mr. Sather of our office who will be in contact with your agents in Selma, Alabama during the next week.

JUL 18 1963

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

July 17, 1963  
72-3-45  
13726  
DLN:jma

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

United States v. Dallas County (Alabama)

A hearing on the Government's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction will be held in the above case on July 25, 1963 at Mobile. Mr. Sather of this office will be directing the preparation for this hearing and he and other members of this staff will be in the Montgomery-Selma area beginning Thursday, July 18, 1963.

Please conduct whatever investigation Mr. Sather may direct.

cc: Records  
Chrono  
Doar  
Putzel  
Trial File  
USA

02 903

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

T. 7/22/63

BM:CWG:mhs  
72-3-18 #317

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

Reproduction of Voter Registration Records, United States v.  
Dallas County, (Ala.) (42 U.S.C. 1971(b))

Pursuant to a telephone conversation between Mr. Hines of your office and Mr. Gabel of my office, and in connection with the preparation of this case, please reproduce one positive reel of each reel containing the Dallas County voter registration records photographed by your agents on November 13, 1961, March 1-2, 1962, and on May 17, 1962. There will be a total of 23 reels.

These positive reels will be used in the trial of this case which will be in Mobile, Alabama, on July 25, 1963. It is therefore requested that they be delivered to Mr. Gabel, in Room 1616, as soon as possible.

4:25 PM 7/24/63



cc: Records  
Chrono  
Doar  
Putzel  
Trial File

ALL 31 1963

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

T. 7/31/63

BM:DLM:mhs  
72-3-45  
#13,728

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

Arrests of Negroes at Voter Registration Meeting in Selma,  
Alabama on July 29, 1963 - 42 U.S.C. 1971(b)

The Department has filed a motion for a preliminary injunction in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Alabama to enjoin Dallas County, Sheriff James Clark, County Solicitor Henry Reese and Circuit Solicitor Blanchard McLeod from intimidating or attempting to intimidate Dallas County Negroes in their efforts to become registered voters. A hearing on the motion was held in Selma, Alabama on July 25 and was recessed the same day to be resumed subsequently.

According to information supplied by your teletype of July 30, 1963, 35 Negroes received traffic summons on the evening of July 29, 1963. These Negroes were apparently driving to a voter registration meeting in Selma, Alabama which was held at Wards Chapel church. The summons were for defective lights, more particularly for not having the rear license plates lit. The summons were presumably given by the Dallas County sheriff's department as your teletype informed that nine members of the sheriff's department "covered the meeting."

Please conduct the following investigation:

1. Identify and interview the 35 persons receiving the summons.
2. Determine whether the license plate lights were purposely put out by these persons prior to receiving the summons and, if so, why.
3. Determine when the summons was received, from whom, and the amount of the fine involved. Also determine whether any of these persons intend to plead innocent and contest the summons and, if so, determine the result of any hearing on the charge.

cc: Records	Putzel
Chrono	Trial File
Doar	U.S. Attorney (Mobile, Ala.)

4. Develop fully from each person his movements and intentions with respect to attending the July 29 meeting up to and including receiving the summons. Also obtain complete details of each person's voting activities in Dallas County, such as, whether he has attended any previous voter registration meeting, (and, if so, which ones) or a voter registration class or whether the person is a registered voter and, if so, the number of times and dates of application. Also determine the reasons each person had for attending the meeting of July 29.

5. For each person get complete background coverage, including their place of employment, name of employer, whether they drive their car to work, age, race, arrest record, military service, address, phone number, marital status and membership in organizations.

6. Interview Sheriff James Clark and determine whether he and his deputies were on duty at Wards Chapel on July 29 and, if so, who was on duty, where were they stationed and what were their duties. Also determine who gave the orders to issue the summons.

7. Interview Chief of Police Mullen to determine the same information as obtained from Sheriff Clark.

8. Furnish a sketch showing the location of the church and surrounding area and designating where the traffic arrests were made.

9. Conduct any further investigation needed to give a clear picture of these incidents of July 29 and follow up any leads necessary thereto.

10. Determine if there were any white persons, including members of the Dallas County Citizens Council or local members of the Ku Klux Klan, in the vicinity of the church which would necessitate the presence of so many law enforcement officials at Wards Chapel.

11. Inspect the records of the City of Selma Police Department and Dallas County Sheriff's office and obtain a list of all persons cited during the past five years for a similar offense and the disposition of the case. Distinguish, when possible, among offenses for improper head



- 3 -

lights, tail lights or reflectors and the instant offense of improper license plate lights.

12. Please expedite this investigation so that the Department may have a complete report as soon as possible.

200 1 1963

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

August 5, 1963

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

BM:JD:lvw  
72-3-45  
13,728

United States v. Dallas County, et al  
Dallas County, Alabama (1971(b))

On August 1, 1963, [REDACTED], a Negro, was tried in County Court for a violation of a criminal statute involving an assumed name. He was found innocent by the County Judge. He would like to obtain a full account of those proceedings.

We have been advised by Attorney Chestnut, [REDACTED] attorney, that Arthur Cabell, a local newspaper reporter, covered the trial. Please interview Mr. Cabell to obtain full details of the proceedings as well as copies of any newspaper stories which he filed.

At the hearing on the preliminary injunction before Judge Thomas on July 25, the local Chief of Police advised Richard Wasserman, an attorney in this Division, that copies of all reports which he had of mass meetings of Negroes during May through July could be inspected and copied or photographed. Kindly undertake to obtain copies of all reports filed with the Selma Police Department purporting to be reports of proceedings at any and all mass meetings of Negroes in Selma during the above period.

cc: United States Attorney Jansen  
Records  
Chrono  
Doar  
Trial File (Room 1140)

August 6, 1953

Re: United States v. Dallas County, et al. (Investigation)

On July 30 [REDACTED] told me that the deputy marshals who served the summons and subpoenas said that all of the sheriff's deputies in Dallas County were friendly and that all of them had something critical to say about Jim Clark; that the only abuse of the federal government came from Clark.

He also said that Tim [REDACTED], Judge Thomas' law clerk, felt that the case was not as strong as our 1971 (a) case.

On July [REDACTED], I talked to Solomon Seay:

1. He recalls that he asked the court to continue the case but the judge took the position that it was a simple case of vagrancy.

2. He recalls seeing McLeod before the trial but it was the day before. He asked for a continuance but McLeod said no, saying that the judge said he wanted to dispose of the case now.

3. He believes that after the trial McLeod said he didn't know much about the case until he got the file just before trying it.

4. [REDACTED] appeal is set for the next term of court in October and will be a trial de novo.

5. I gave him the message about the [REDACTED] case.

I also discussed this case with Slim Barrett and he feels that as a practical matter of intimidatory effect it is essential and also thinks we should put on rebuttal testimony.

= On July 31 I talked with J. O. Chestnut:

1. The [REDACTED] trial would come on Thursday at 10:00 a.m.

2. McLeod made no such statement as he testified to Chestnut. They did talk about a continuance.

3. Thirty-five people were arrested for improper lights last Monday night. Fines were running about \$12.50.

I then called Bernard Lafayette and he said that thirty people had been stopped in cars and twenty people had gotten traffic tickets for improper lights. He also said that on July 30 his wife received a threatening phone call.

He is leaving for New York. On August 2, I called Chestnut again and he said that [redacted] was found innocent. He said that Clark's testimony was simply that the boy told him his name was [redacted] but the name on the license was [redacted]. Deputy Bates reiterated this. [redacted] said that Clark said to him, "You smart nigger, get in the car." The only interesting thing was that there was a special deputy in the car with Clark and he had a lot of difficulty explaining what he was doing there. Chestnut did not recall his name. We should look into this further. He said that Arthur Cabell, a local newspaper reporter, had a full account.

Richard Wasserstrom  
Attorney  
Civil Rights Division

August 8, 1963

John Doar  
First Assistant

JD:lw  
72-3-45  
13,728

United States v. Dallas County, et al  
Dallas County, Alabama (1971(b))

I was disappointed when I received the photos of the exhibits from the Bureau in the case of United States v. Dallas County, et al. In the first place, all of the exhibits were photostated even those of which we already had copies. I can see no reason for this. A lawyer in private practice would not have a client very long if he put the client to needless expense.

Secondly, the frame numbers that the Bureau used do not correspond with the numbers of the various exhibits. I would have thought that this could have been easily arranged.

I am enclosing a set of the exhibits. Please see that the exhibit folder is properly made up and make a second exhibit folder for me.

cc: Norman  
Doar ✓

AUG 8 1953

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

August 8, 1953

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

BM:JD:lm  
72-3-43  
12,728

United States v. Dallas County, et al  
Dallas County, Alabama (1971(b))

With respect to the photographing of the exhibits  
in United States v. Dallas County, Alabama, et al, I  
would appreciate it if you would do the following:

1. Prepare one print standard size of Frame  
30 consisting of seven pages constituting Exhibit  
33 and deliver said positive print to United  
States Attorney Jansen in order that he may  
substitute same in the official records of  
the Clerk of the Court.
2. Obtain from United States Attorney Jansen  
the original documents introduced as Exhibit  
33 and deliver them personally to Alexander  
Brown who is living in Selma, Alabama.
3. Please furnish me one positive print of  
Exhibit 35, blown up to approximate size of  
16" x 20".
4. Also furnish me with the first page of  
Frame 32, enlarged to the same size (16" x  
20").

cc: United States Attorney  
Records  
Chrono  
Dear ✓  
Trial File (Room 1140)

August 8, 1963

AIR MAIL

Honorable Vernel R. Jansen  
United States Attorney  
Southern District of Alabama  
Mobile, Alabama

Re: U. S. v. Dallas County, et al  
(1971(b))

Dear Mr. Jansen:

I am having the Bureau furnish you with photostats of the originals contained in Exhibit 33 in the above case. Will you please take care of the substitution and see that the Bureau delivers the originals to [REDACTED] at Selma.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOAR  
First Assistant  
Civil Rights Division

cc: Records  
Chrono  
Doar ✓  
Trail File (Room 1140)

(1-6)

Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C.

Mobile, Ala.

Aug. 13, 1963

Vernol R. Jansen, Jr.  
U. S. Attorney, Mobile, Ala.

United States v. Dallas County, Alabama, et al  
Civil Action No. 3064-63

ATTENTION: Civil Rights Division

You are advised that we have today been notified by the Court that the above-captioned case has been set for continuation of hearing at Selma, Alabama, on Thursday, October 3, 1963, at 10:00 A. M.

VRJJr:AG

100-12-10-100



JF: 10/2/62

October 2, 1962

Honorable Daniel H. Thomas  
Judge, United States District Court  
Southern District of Alabama  
Mobile, Alabama

Re: United States v. Dallas County  
Alabama et al. (Selma 197 (L))  
Civil Action No. 3043-62

Dear Judge Thomas:

At the conference on the above case on October 2, 1962, at Selma I mentioned to the Court that during the oral argument of the case of United States v. Lynx before the Court of Appeals on April 3, 1962 at Houston Judge Hutchinson made certain statements with respect to obligation of the Court to promptly decide either favorably or unfavorably on an application for a preliminary injunction. There is attached herewith a copy of that part of the transcript for your examination.

By way of explanation, I should like to tell the Court that this was a case involving alleged racial discrimination by the registrar of voters of Forrest County, Mississippi. Our motion for preliminary injunction was heard by the District Court on the 5th, 6th and 7th of March 1962 and at the close of the hearing, the district judge declined either to grant or deny the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction on the theory that the hearing had not been concluded.

Respectfully,

Chas.

For

Legal File (1347)

Putzel

The Government appealed and moved for an injunction pending appeal. It was at the oral argument of this motion that this discussion took place:

I am citing this to the Court for the proposition that on a motion for a preliminary injunction if the district judge declines to act he in effect has denied the injunction.

Respectfully yours

Attachments

JOHN ROAR  
First Assistant  
Chief of the Division

cc: Hon. Blanchard McLean  
Circuit Solicitor  
Canton, Alabama

McLean Pitts, Esq.  
Pitts & Pitts  
Selma, Alabama

Hon. Gordon Madison  
Asst. Attorney General  
Montgomery, Alabama

Correspondence - H. S. & Dallas  
County, Alabama, et al

72-345

12,728

(6)  
JUN 15 1963

T. 6/13/63

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

BM:DRO:ash  
72-3-New

Intimidation in Registration and Voting,  
Selma, Alabama

This will confirm the conversation between  
Mr. Owen of this office and Mr. Sullivan of your  
office on June 13, 1963 at 9:55 a.m., that we  
desire you to conduct a full investigation of the  
beating of Bernard Lafayette in Selma, Alabama,  
on the night of June 11, 1963, to establish a  
violation of 42 U.S.C. 1971(b).

This memorandum is being sent to you by special  
messenger.

6-13-2 PM

cc: Records  
Chrono  
Doar ✓  
Putzel  
Trial File(Rm. 1140)  
USA, Mobile, Ala.

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

June 19, 1963

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

BH:DRO:lvw

72-3-45  
13,728

Intimidation in Registration and Voting  
Dallas County, Alabama (42 U.S.C. 1971(b))

This will confirm the conversation between Mr. Owen of this office and Mr. McDonough of your office requesting that the Bureau make investigations of particular incidents in Dallas County, Alabama as may be requested by Arvid A. Sather and David H. Harlin, attorneys from this Division, who are in Selma, Alabama at my request to check into reports of the use of the criminal processes to intimidate Negroes or Negro registration workers and reports of economic reprisals by private persons to intimidate Negroes from registering to vote.

If you have any information with respect to either of these problems in Dallas County please make such information available to Mr. Sather and Mr. Harlin.

This memorandum is being sent to you by special messenger.

cc: U. S. Attorney

Records  
Chrono  
Doar ✓  
Trial File (Room 1140)

Received by Bureau 6/20/63; 1:00 P.M. CJM

13 803

Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Burke Marshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

BH:BJB:arg

Dallas County, Alabama.  
Voter Registration Drive

This will confirm an investigative request telephoned by Mr. Barrett, of this Division, to Mr. MacGowan, of your Bureau, on June 17.

This Division received a telephone call on June 17, 1963, from Bernard Lafayette, [redacted], Selma, Alabama. Mr. Lafayette is the victim in an investigation presently being conducted by your Bureau at our request. Mr. Lafayette advised that on June 17 he sent two of his coworkers in the Dallas County registration drive, [redacted] and [redacted], to the Dallas County Courthouse to observe Negroes applying for registration. While the two men were in a corridor of the courthouse the deputy sheriff told them to move on. As they were leaving in compliance with this order the deputy struck [redacted] and placed him under arrest. [redacted] fled the courthouse and reported the incident to Lafayette who, in turn, reported it to an Agent of your Bureau in Selma.

Mr. Lafayette has been advised by the sheriff of Dallas County that [redacted] is charged with failure to obey an officer and resisting arrest.

Please conduct the following investigation:

1. Interview [redacted] and [redacted] for details regarding the incident at the courthouse. Also obtain the usual background information with particular emphasis on the nature of the work that [redacted] and [redacted] have been doing in Dallas County, and any prior contacts they have had with local officials which would have apprised such officials of the nature of their work.

2. Interview any other witnesses present at the courthouse who may have observed the incident. Mr. Lafayette advises that he can provide your Agents with the names of a

cc: Records Chron. V Mr. Doar Mr. Norman Mr. Barrett

U.S. Attorney, Mobile, Ala.

number of Negroes who observed the incident while they were waiting to apply for registration as voters. In interviewing the Negro registration applicants, determine their knowledge of the connection of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] with the voter registration drive, and what effect, if any, the assault upon and arrest of Rees had upon such applicant's estimate of the official attitude toward his effort to register.

3. Identify and interview the deputy sheriff who arrested and is alleged to have assaulted [REDACTED]
4. Take color photographs of any observable injury to [REDACTED] resulting from the assault.
5. Determine the status of the charges against [REDACTED]

June 19, 1963

Memo to the Files

From Carl Gabel

Re: Telephone conversation with Mr. Chestnut, Attorney,  
Selma, Alabama concerning arrest of Reverend Bernard  
Lafayette

Mr. Chestnut, a Negro attorney in Selma, Alabama, phoned the Department at 11:30 a.m. on June 19 to inform us that Reverend Bernard Lafayette had been arrested. Mr. Chestnut said that Reverend Lafayette is now in jail and that he was arrested on a charge of vagrancy after leaving a voter registration meeting last night in Selma. Trial is scheduled for tomorrow morning before Judge Hugh Mallory.

Mr. Chestnut said that about 40 Negroes staged a sit-in at his house last night and that the Negro population is becoming very restless and he feels that demonstrations may occur in the near future. Mr. Chestnut spoke with the sheriff of Dallas County concerning Reverend Lafayette's arrest and the sheriff was very adamant and Mr. Chestnut does not think that Mr. Lafayette will be released.

I informed Mr. Chestnut that Dave Marlin would be in contact with him this morning.

Mr. Chestnut can be reached at TR 2-3759. His office is on Franklin Street, at Mrs. Boynton's insurance agency. Mr. Chestnut's home phone number is [REDACTED] and he lives at [REDACTED]



June 27, 1963

Honorable Gordon Madison  
Assistant Attorney General  
State of Alabama  
Montgomery, Alabama

Re: United States of America v.  
Dallas County, Alabama, et al

Dear Mr. Madison:

Enclosed are one copy each of Motion to Dismiss  
Appeal and Per Curium Order, in the above styled case,  
presented this morning to Judge Richard T. Rives, 5th  
Circuit Court of Appeals.

These are sent to you at the request of Honorable  
John Doar, Attorney, U. S. Department of Justice.

Yours very truly,

Clerk

Encls.

U.S. District Court  
1971(8)

June 27, 1963

200-11

Honorable Blanchard McLeod  
Circuit Solicitor  
Dallas County  
Camden, Alabama

Re: United States of America v.  
Dallas County, Alabama, et al

Dear Mr. McLeod:

Enclosed are one copy each of Motion to Dismiss  
Appeal and Per Curium Order, in the above styled case,  
presented this morning to Judge Richard T. Rives, 5th Circuit  
Court of Appeals.

These are sent to you at the request of Honorable  
John Doar, Attorney, U. S. Department of Justice.

Yours very truly,

Clerk

Encls.

July 8, 1963

Honorable Vernol R. Jansen  
United States Attorney  
Mobile, Alabama

Re: United States v. Dallas County,  
Alabama, et al. - Civil Action  
No. 3064-63

Dear Mr. Jansen:

There is enclosed for your files a complete set  
of the pleadings filed in the above-entitled case.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOAR  
First Assistant  
Civil Rights Division

Enclosures